

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. The following remarks are responsive to the Final Office Action mailed May 2, 2006.

35 USC §102 Rejections

Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kronstadt et al (4,725,945). The Office Action states in its response to Applicant's arguments that Figure 3 shows the RAS and CAS signals as being bidirectional and therefore must carry data. Figure 3 merely shows a conglomeration of signals from the memory controller to the memory system, which include bidirectional signals. However, Figure 4, further elaborates on Figure 3 by showing that indeed the RAS and CAS signals are uni-directional. Therefore, the basis for the Office Action's rejection is based on an incorrect observation/assumption. Applicant resubmits the arguments made in the previous response, stating that because RAS and CAS of Kronstadt do not carry data, they cannot anticipate Applicant's claims.

However, Applicant has also amended claim 1 to more clearly indicate that the data lines are to carry data from the regular and redundant banks, a feature not shown by Kronstadt. Regardless of any amendments, Applicant submits claims 1, 7 and 12 and the claims that depend therefrom are in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 USC §103 (a). However, these rejections are moot in light of the above amendments and arguments pertaining to


claims 1, 7, and 12. Accordingly, Applicant submits claims 1, 7 and 12 and the claims that depend therefrom are in condition for allowance,

If there are any additional fees due, please charge them to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: November 1, 2006



Thomas Ferrill
Reg. No. 42,532

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300